UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/535,734	11/03/2005	Yuichi Nakada	123992	2149	
25944 OLIFF & BERI	7590 09/16/201 RIDGE, PLC	EXAMINER			
P.O. BOX 3208	350	KNABLE, GEOFFREY L			
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1791		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/16/2010	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction25944@oliff.com jarmstrong@oliff.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/535,734	NAKADA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Geoffrey L. Knable	1791	

	Geoffrey L. Knable	1791	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 27 August 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (l	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth intermental atter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	on.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f		TINGT INLEED WAS TI	LLD WITTIIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount of the control of the corresponding amount of the control of the corresponding amount of the corresponding	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL  2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complete	liance with 27 CED 44 27 must be	ilad within two month	a of the data of
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	e appeal. Since a
<u></u>	t union to the plate of filling a build	حط لحصوفون حط فمع الأنب	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better the proposed amendment (see NOTE).	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c			
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
<ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ul>		mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-12. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ll and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	10 5 11 11		
	/Geoffrey L. Knable/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1791	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: First, the amendment does partially overcome the previous 35 USC 112 rejections but it is still seemingly difficult to determine how the waveform/correlation is specifically used to practice the claimed process. It is noted that however if claim 10 were additionally amended to specifically refer to obtaining the inverted waveform of the primary component as part of the measuring step and then using the determined correlation to control the displacements to obtain this inverted waveform (i.e. define the process in essentially the same manner as original claim 10), then the 112 rejections would be removed and subject to acceptance of the previously filed terminal disclaimer (and an updated statement of common ownership), such a claim would be allowable over the closest prior art. With respect to the statement of common ownership in particular, the statement on page 13 of applicant's response is at present deficient as it does not specifically indicate that the inventions were common owned "at the time the claimed invention was made" (i.e. at the time the invention of this application was made) - see MPEP 706.02(I)(2)(II) for an exemplary statement. Additionally, formalities review of the submitted terminal disclaimer is still pending and if approved, the previous obviousness double patenting rejection of claim 10 will be withdrawn. As to claim 1, it is still submitted that the prior art would teach broadly adjusting a position of a carcass and bead, this reading on for example even placement of a carcass (and beads) in a mold.